AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Figures 2-10 have been amended to use the symbol conventions in MPEP 608.02, per request of the Examiner.

REMARKS

Applicants thank Examiner Davis for the analysis contained in the Office Action mailed

October 12, 2007, and for the indication that Claims 8, 10, and 19 are allowed. Claims 1-3, 8, 10,

12, 13, and 19 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Applicants

request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

<u>Informalities in the Drawings</u>

The Examiner objected to the drawings, requesting that the elastomer coating layer utilize

the proper material identification in the drawings. Figure 2-10 have been amended accordingly.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to the term "the rotor" in Claim 1. This has been corrected and the

objection thus overcome.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claim 1 presently stands rejected as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, as being

obvious over Forrest.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Forrest reference does not anticipate the claims of the

present application. The structure disclosed by Forrest placed external support in the form of a

cylindrical outer casing 14 around the stator, to protect the stator. This external support indicates

that the stator was not able to resist pressure, torque, and axial loads experienced in its intended

operating environment. This contrasts with applicants' disclosure in Figures 1, 5, and 7. Applicants

have amended Claim 1 to specify that the stator for which protection is sought is externally

unsupported.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Forrest reference does not render obvious the present

invention. One skilled in the art reviewing Forrest would not consider removing the cylindrical

outer casing 14.

LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS**LLC 1420 Fifth Avenue

Suite 2800 Seattle, Washington 98101 206.682.8100

-5-

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1 further stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Forrest in

view of Marando and Bird et al.

The Marando reference teaches a hydroforming fixture. The Bird et al. reference contains a

statement of general application that hydroforming is possible in a broad range of sizes up to one

inch thick. There is no indication that it will work with sufficient accuracy on a stator profile when

in the thicker ranges. Applicants respectfully submit, that when combined with Forrest reference,

the Bird et al. reference would lead to a configuration having a cylindrical outer housing, as taught

by Forrest.

Claim 12 has been amended to incorporate features from page 11 of the specification

between lines 23-24, that being a thicker elastomer coating at major sealing locations and a thinner

elastomer coating at minor sealing locations. It is respectfully submitted that this specific teaching

goes beyond any teaching that can be extracted from Forrest.

In view of the foregoing amendments, applicants respectfully submit that the present

application is now in condition for allowance. Applicants, therefore, request the early issue of a

Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR

JOHNSON KINDNESS PLLC

Kevan L. Morgan

Registration No. 42,015

Direct Dial No. 206.695.1712

KLM:jlb

LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESSPLLC 1420 Fifth Avenue Suite 2800

Suite 2800 Seattle, Washington 98101 206.682.8100